



UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
on  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: JOHNSON & JOHNSON TALCUM  
POWDER PRODUCTS MARKETING, SALES  
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY  
LITIGATION

MDL No. 2738

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)


CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO -249)

On October 4, 2016, the Panel transferred 10 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. *See* 220 F.Supp.3d 1356 (J.P.M.L. 2016). Since that time, 2,258 additional action(s) have been transferred to the District of New Jersey. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Freda L. Wolfson.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the District of New Jersey and assigned to Judge Wolfson.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the District of New Jersey for the reasons stated in the order of October 4, 2016, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Freda L. Wolfson.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7-day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.



FOR THE PANEL:

John W. Nichols  
Clerk of the Panel

**IN RE: JOHNSON & JOHNSON TALCUM  
POWDER PRODUCTS MARKETING, SALES  
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY  
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2738

**SCHEDULE CTO-249 – TAG-ALONG ACTIONS**

<b><u>DIST</u></b>	<b><u>DIV.</u></b>	<b><u>C.A.NO.</u></b>	<b><u>CASE CAPTION</u></b>
FLORIDA MIDDLE			
FLM	8	21-00497	Kendrick v. Johnson & Johnson et al